

May, 2008  
OCU-PHYS 299

# Closed conformal Killing-Yano tensor and uniqueness of generalized Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime

Tsuyoshi Houri<sup>a\*</sup>, Takeshi Oota<sup>b†</sup> and Yukinori Yasui<sup>a‡</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Physics, Graduate School of Science,  
Osaka City University  
3-3-138 Sugimoto, Sumiyoshi, Osaka 558-8585, JAPAN*

<sup>b</sup>*Osaka City University Advanced Mathematical Institute (OCAMI)  
3-3-138 Sugimoto, Sumiyoshi, Osaka 558-8585, JAPAN*

## Abstract

The higher-dimensional Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime describes the general rotating asymptotically de Sitter black hole with NUT parameters. It is known that such a spacetime possesses a rank-2 closed conformal Killing-Yano (CKY) tensor as a “hidden” symmetry which provides the separation of variables for the geodesic equations and Klein-Gordon equations. We present a classification of higher-dimensional spacetimes admitting a rank-2 closed CKY tensor. This provides a generalization of the Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime. In particular, we show that the Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime is the only spacetime with a non-degenerate CKY tensor.

---

\* [hour@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp](mailto:hour@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp)

† [toota@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp](mailto:toota@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp)

‡ [yasui@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp](mailto:yasui@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp)

# 1 Introduction

Symmetries play important roles in search of exact solutions to the Einstein equations. Killing vector fields and conformal Killing vector fields generate isometries and conformal isometries of the spacetime, respectively. Totally symmetric generalization of the Killing vector is called a Killing tensor. In [1], Yano introduced so-called Killing-Yano tensor, which is totally antisymmetric extension of the Killing vector. Later, the notion of conformal Killing-Yano (CKY) tensor was introduced in [2, 3, 4].

Floyd [5] and Penrose [6] pointed out that the  $D = 4$  Kerr spacetime possesses a rank-2 Killing tensor which can be constructed from a rank-2 CKY tensor. Therefore, the CKY tensor reveals “hidden” symmetries of the Kerr metric.

The  $D$ -dimensional Kerr-NUT-de Sitter metric was constructed by Chen-Lü-Pope [7]. The metric is the most general known solution describing the higher-dimensional rotating black hole spacetime with NUT parameters. It takes the form

$$g = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{dx_\mu^2}{Q_\mu(x)} + \sum_{\mu=1}^n Q_\mu(x) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sigma_k(\hat{x}_\mu) d\psi_k \right)^2 + \frac{\varepsilon c}{\sigma_n} \left( \sum_{k=0}^n \sigma_k d\psi_k \right)^2, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $D = 2n + \varepsilon$  ( $\varepsilon = 0$  or  $1$ ). The functions  $Q_\mu$  ( $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) are given by

$$Q_\mu(x) = \frac{X_\mu}{U_\mu}, \quad U_\mu = \prod_{\substack{\nu=1 \\ (\nu \neq \mu)}}^n (x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2), \quad (1.2)$$

where  $X_\mu = X_\mu(x_\mu)$  is an arbitrary function depending on one coordinate  $x_\mu$ . The  $\sigma_k$  and  $\sigma_k(\hat{x}_\mu)$  are the  $k$ -th elementary symmetric functions of  $\{x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2\}$  and  $\{x_\nu^2 : \nu \neq \mu\}$  respectively:

$$\prod_{\nu=1}^n (t - x_\nu^2) = \sigma_0 t^n - \sigma_1 t^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^n \sigma_n, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\prod_{\substack{\nu=1 \\ (\nu \neq \mu)}}^n (t - x_\nu^2) = \sigma_0(\hat{x}_\mu) t^{n-1} - \sigma_1(\hat{x}_\mu) t^{n-2} + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} \sigma_{n-1}(\hat{x}_\mu). \quad (1.4)$$

The metric satisfies the Einstein equation  $Ric(g) = \Lambda g$  if and only if  $X_\mu$  takes the form [7, 8],

$$(a) \quad \varepsilon = 0 : X_\mu = \sum_{k=0}^n c_k x_\mu^{2k} + b_\mu x_\mu, \quad (b) \quad \varepsilon = 1 : X_\mu = \sum_{k=0}^n c_k x_\mu^{2k} + b_\mu + \frac{(-1)^n c}{x_\mu^2}, \quad (1.5)$$

where  $c, c_k$  and  $b_\mu$  are free parameters. This class of metrics gives the Kerr-NUT-de Sitter metric [7], and the solutions in [9, 10, 11, 12, 13] are recovered by choosing special parameters.

It turns out that the higher-dimensional Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetimes have very common features with the  $D = 4$  Kerr families. In particular, they have a rank-2 closed CKY tensor, which generates “hidden” symmetries [14, 15]. The hidden symmetries imply complete integrability of geodesic equations [16, 17] and complete separation of variables for the Hamilton-Jacobi [18], Klein-Gordon [18] and Dirac equations [19]. Various aspects related to the integrability have been extensively studied in [20, 21, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. For reviews on these subjects, see, for example, [28, 29]. These results on the integrability may be important for the study of the gravitational perturbations and the stability of higher-dimensional black hole spacetimes. Recently, some progress in this direction was done in [30, 31, 32].

This integrability leads to a natural question whether there are other geometries with such a CKY tensor. Here we prove that the Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime is unique geometry. Let  $h$  be a rank-2 CKY tensor and  $\hat{\xi}$  associated vector of  $h$ . In [23], we briefly sketched the proof of the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose a  $D$ -dimensional spacetime  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  admits a non-degenerate rank-2 CKY tensor  $h$  satisfying the conditions*

$$(a1) \quad dh = 0, \quad (a2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\xi}} g = 0, \quad (a3) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\xi}} h = 0.$$

*Then,  $\mathcal{M}$  is only the Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime.*

The proof given in [23] was not completely satisfactory because it was based on the existence of geodesic separable coordinates [33, 34, 35] and a brute force calculation. Furthermore, the role of the closed CKY tensor was not clear. We have been trying to improve the proof of Theorem 1 in such a way that the role of the CKY tensor is clearly seen. Moreover, in [23] we assumed that the eigenvalues of the closed CKY tensor are functionally independent, i.e., non-degenerate. But it is known that the celebrated  $D = 4$  Euclidean Taub-NUT space has a degenerate rank-2 closed CKY tensor [36, 37]. The assumption of non-degeneracy excludes such important class of spacetimes.

Therefore, we reconsider the problem without the assumption of non-degeneracy. The CKY tensor generally has the non-constant eigenvalues and the constant ones. Let  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  be a  $D$ -dimensional spacetime with a closed rank-2 CKY tensor  $h$ . Let  $x_\mu$  ( $\mu = 1, \dots, n$ )

and  $\xi_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) be the non-constant eigenvalues and the non-zero constant ones of  $h$ , respectively. Suppose the eigenvalues of the “square of the CKY tensor”  $Q = (Q^a_b) = (-h^a_c h^c_b)$  have the following multiplicities:

$$\{\underbrace{x_1^2, \dots, x_1^2}_{2\ell_1}, \dots, \underbrace{x_n^2, \dots, x_n^2}_{2\ell_n}, \underbrace{\xi_1^2, \dots, \xi_1^2}_{2m_1}, \dots, \underbrace{\xi_N^2, \dots, \xi_N^2}_{2m_N}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_K\}, \quad (1.6)$$

where  $D = 2(|\ell| + |m|) + K$ . Here  $|\ell| = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \ell_\mu$  and  $|m| = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$ .

Analyses for the non-degenerate and some degenerate cases with  $|m| = 0$  can be found in [26].<sup>1</sup> We obtained the following results [38]:

**Theorem 2.** *The metric  $g$  and the closed rank-2 CKY tensor  $h$  take the forms*

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{dx_\mu^2}{P_\mu(x)} + \sum_{\mu=1}^n P_\mu(x) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sigma_k(\hat{x}_\mu) \theta_k \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{\mu=1}^n (x_\mu^2 - \xi_i^2) g^{(i)} + \sigma_n g^{(0)}, \\ h &= \sum_{\mu=1}^n x_\mu dx_\mu \wedge \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sigma_k(\hat{x}_\mu) \theta_k \right) + \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i \prod_{\mu=1}^n (x_\mu^2 - \xi_i^2) \omega^{(i)}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

The metrics  $g^{(i)}$  are Kähler metrics on  $2m_i$ -dimensional Kähler manifolds  $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}$  and  $\omega^{(i)}$  the corresponding Kähler forms. The metric  $g^{(0)}$  is, in general, any metric on a  $K$ -dimensional manifold  $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}$ . But if  $K = 1$ ,  $g^{(0)}$  can take the special form:

$$\sigma_n g_{\text{special}}^{(0)} = \frac{c}{\sigma_n} \left( \sum_{k=0}^n \sigma_k \theta_k \right)^2. \quad (1.8)$$

The functions  $P_\mu$  are defined by

$$P_\mu(x) = \frac{X_\mu(x_\mu)}{x_\mu^K \prod_{i=1}^N (x_\mu^2 - \xi_i^2)^{m_i} U_\mu}, \quad (1.9)$$

with an arbitrary function  $X_\mu$  depending on one variable  $x_\mu$ . The 1-forms  $\theta_k$  satisfy

$$d\theta_k + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N (-1)^{n-k} \xi_i^{2n-2k-1} \omega^{(i)} = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1+\varepsilon, \quad (1.10)$$

where  $\varepsilon = 0$  for the general type and  $\varepsilon = 1$  for the special type.

---

<sup>1</sup> In [26], the eigenvalue problem for a square of the parallel-propagated two-form  $F$  was studied, not the eigenvalue problem for a square of the closed CKY tensor  $h$ .

The metric may be locally given as a Kaluza-Klein metric on the bundle over Kähler manifolds whose fibers are Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetimes. The Einstein condition of the generalized Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime can be found in [38].

In this paper, we give a proof of Theorem 2. Theorem 1 follows as a special case of Theorem 2.

In completing the improvement of our proof, the paper [27] appeared. The authors of [27] investigated the non-degenerate cases, and proved that the assumptions (a2) and (a3) are superfluous because they follow from the existence of the CKY tensor. In the following proof, we owe very much to their insights that the conditions (a2) and (a3) can be obtained from (a1). In particular, we use their result to obtain Lemma 3:  $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\xi}}h = 0$ . The authors of [27] obtained the condition  $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\xi}}g = 0$  at the final stage of their proof. In this paper, we show that the Killing vector condition can be obtained at earlier stage by taking into account of the symmetry (3.11).

## 2 A second-rank CKY tensor

In this section, we briefly review the rank-2 CKY tensor and explain our notation. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $D$ -dimensional spacetime with the metric

$$g = g_{ab}dy^a dy^b, \quad a, b = 1, 2, \dots, D. \quad (2.1)$$

Suppose  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  has a rank-2 conformal Killing Yano (CKY) tensor [2]

$$h = \frac{1}{2}h_{ab}dy^a \wedge dy^b, \quad h_{ab} = -h_{ba}, \quad (2.2)$$

which satisfies

$$\nabla_a h_{bc} + \nabla_b h_{ac} = 2g_{ab}\hat{\xi}_c - g_{ac}\hat{\xi}_b - g_{bc}\hat{\xi}_a, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\nabla_a = \nabla_{\partial_a}$  is the Levi-Civita connection, and

$$\hat{\xi}_a = \frac{1}{D-1}\nabla^b h_{ba}. \quad (2.4)$$

$\hat{\xi} = \xi^a \partial_a \in T\mathcal{M}$  is called the associated vector of the CKY tensor  $h$ . To any vector  $X \in T\mathcal{M}$ , let us associate a 1-form  $X^\vee$  as follows:

$$X^\vee(Y) := g(X, Y), \quad \forall Y \in T\mathcal{M}. \quad (2.5)$$

Then (2.4) can be written as follows

$$\hat{\xi}^\vee = -\frac{1}{D-1}\delta h, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\delta$  is the adjoint of the exterior derivative  $d$ .

Let us introduce a  $(1, 1)$ -tensor  $H : T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M}$  which is associated with  $h$ :

$$H = h^a_b \partial_a \otimes dy^b, \quad h^a_b = g^{ac} h_{cb}. \quad (2.7)$$

Also, let  $Q : T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M}$  be a  $(1, 1)$ -tensor defined by

$$Q = -H^2 = Q^a_b \partial_a \otimes dy^b, \quad Q^a_b = -h^a_c h^c_b. \quad (2.8)$$

Let us assume that the eigenvalues of  $Q$  have the following form:

$$Q = V \text{diag}(\underbrace{x_1^2, \dots, x_1^2}_{2\ell_1}, \dots, \underbrace{x_n^2, \dots, x_n^2}_{2\ell_n}, \underbrace{\xi_1^2, \dots, \xi_1^2}_{2m_1}, \dots, \underbrace{\xi_N^2, \dots, \xi_N^2}_{2m_N}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_K) V^{-1}. \quad (2.9)$$

The eigenvalues  $x_\mu^2$  are non-zero functions of the local coordinate  $y^a$  and the eigenvalues  $\xi_j^2$  are non-zero constants. Furthermore, we assume that none of pairs from  $\{x_\mu^2, \xi_j^2\}$  is equal to each other. Note that  $D = 2|\ell| + 2|m| + K$  where  $|\ell| = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \ell_\mu$  and  $|m| = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j$ .

We can decompose the tangent bundle into the eigenspaces of  $Q$ :

$$T\mathcal{M} = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \oplus T\mathcal{M}^{(x_\mu^2)} \sum_{j=1}^N \oplus T\mathcal{M}^{(\xi_j^2)} \oplus T\mathcal{M}^{(0)}, \quad (2.10)$$

where  $T\mathcal{M}^{(\lambda)} = \{v \in T\mathcal{M} \mid Qv = \lambda v\}$  for  $\lambda = x_\mu^2, \xi_j^2, 0$ . It is convenient to introduce the projectors  $\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)} : T\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M}^{(\lambda)}$ :

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)} v \in T\mathcal{M}^{(\lambda)}, \quad v \in T\mathcal{M}. \quad (2.11)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda')} = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)}$ ,  $Q\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)} = \lambda \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)}$ ,

$$Q = \sum_{\mu=1}^n x_\mu^2 \mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} + \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^2 \mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)}. \quad (2.12)$$

For any vectors  $X = X^a \partial_a$  and  $Y = Y^a \partial_a$ , let us denote their inner product by  $(X, Y) := g_{ab} X^a Y^b$ . Let us choose an orthonormal basis  $e_A \in T\mathcal{M}$  of the tangent vectors<sup>2</sup>

$$(e_A, e_B) = \delta_{AB}, \quad A, B = 1, 2, \dots, D. \quad (2.13)$$

It is convenient to take the basis vectors  $e_A$  as eigenvectors of projectors  $\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)}$ . We choose an orthonormal basis of  $T\mathcal{M}^{(x_\mu^2)}$ ,  $T\mathcal{M}^{(\xi_j^2)}$  and  $T\mathcal{M}^{(0)}$

$$\{e_\alpha^{[\mu]}, e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,\ell_\mu}, \quad \{e_\alpha^{(j)}, e_{m_j + \alpha}^{(j)}\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,m_j}, \quad \{e_\alpha^{(0)}\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,K}, \quad (2.14)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Here, we assume the positive definite signature for simplicity. The signature of the spacetime is irrelevant in the following argument. Indefinite signature cases can be formally treated by ‘‘Wick rotation.’’

respectively, such that

$$H e_\alpha^{[\mu]} = -x_\mu e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}, \quad H e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]} = x_\mu e_\alpha^{[\mu]}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, \ell_\mu, \quad (2.15)$$

$$H e_\alpha^{(j)} = -\xi_j e_{m_j + \alpha}^{(j)}, \quad H e_{m_j + \alpha}^{(j)} = \xi_j e_\alpha^{(j)}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, m_j, \quad (2.16)$$

$$H e_\alpha^{(0)} = 0, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, K. \quad (2.17)$$

We denote their dual one-forms (vielbeins) as follows:

$$\{e_{[\mu]}^\alpha, e_{[\mu]}^{\ell_\mu + \alpha}\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,\ell_\mu}, \quad \{e_{(j)}^\alpha, e_{(j)}^{m_j + \alpha}\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,m_j}, \quad \{e_{(0)}^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,K}. \quad (2.18)$$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 2

We assume that the second rank CKY tensor  $h$  is closed:  $dh = 0$ . The relation (2.3) with this condition leads to the following equations for the closed CKY tensor:

$$\nabla_a h_{bc} = g_{ab} \widehat{\xi}_c - g_{ac} \widehat{\xi}_b. \quad (3.1)$$

**Lemma 1.** *The multiplicity constant  $\ell_\mu$  in (2.9) of the non-constant eigenvalue  $x_\mu^2$  is equal to one:*

$$\ell_\mu = 1, \quad \mu = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (3.2)$$

(Proof of Lemma 1). From (2.15),  $x_\mu$  can be expressed as follows:

$$x_\mu = (e_\alpha^{[\mu]}, H e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}), \quad (\forall \alpha \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_\mu\}; \text{no sum}). \quad (3.3)$$

Since  $(e_\alpha^{[\mu]}, e_\alpha^{[\mu]}) = (e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}, e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}) = 1$ , it holds that

$$(e_\alpha^{[\mu]}, \nabla_a e_\alpha^{[\mu]}) = (e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}, \nabla_a e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}) = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Using (3.1), (3.3) and (3.4), we have

$$\partial_a x_\mu = (\partial_a, e_\alpha^{[\mu]})(\widehat{\xi}, e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}) - (\partial_a, e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]})(\widehat{\xi}, e_\alpha^{[\mu]}), \quad \forall \alpha \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_\mu\}. \quad (3.5)$$

For  $\ell_\mu > 1$ , this equation leads to

$$(\widehat{\xi}, e_\alpha^{[\mu]}) = (\widehat{\xi}, e_{\ell_\mu + \alpha}^{[\mu]}) = 0, \quad \text{if } \ell_\mu > 1. \quad (3.6)$$

These relations mean that  $\partial_a x_\mu = 0$ , i.e.,  $x_\mu$  is a constant, which contradicts the assumption  $x_\mu = x_\mu(y)$ .  $\square$

Now the eigenvalues of  $Q$  are given by

$$Q = V \text{diag}(\underbrace{x_1^2, x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2, x_n^2}_2, \underbrace{\xi_1^2, \dots, \xi_1^2}_{2m_1}, \dots, \underbrace{\xi_N^2, \dots, \xi_N^2}_{2m_N}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_K) V^{-1}. \quad (3.7)$$

The functions  $x_\mu^2$  and the constants  $\xi_j^2$  are all different and non-zero. Note that  $D = 2n + |m| + K$  where  $|m| = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j$ .

We slightly change the notation. Let  $e_\mu := e_1^{[\mu]}$ ,  $e_{n+\mu} := e_2^{[\mu]}$  for  $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Now the basis of orthonormal vectors is given by

$$\{e_A\}_{A=1,2,\dots,D} = \{e_\mu, e_{n+\mu}, e_{\alpha_j}^{(j)}, e_{m_j+\alpha_j}^{(j)}, e_{\alpha_0}^{(0)}\}, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,  $\alpha_j = 1, 2, \dots, m_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ), and  $\alpha_0 = 1, 2, \dots, K$ . We also denote the dual 1-forms as follows:

$$\{e^A\}_{A=1,2,\dots,D} = \{e^\mu, e^{n+\mu}, e_{(j)}^{\alpha_j}, e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha_j}, e_{(0)}^{\alpha_0}\}. \quad (3.9)$$

The closed CKY tensor takes the form

$$h = \sum_{\mu=1}^n x_\mu e^\mu \wedge e^{n+\mu} + \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_j} \xi_j e_{(j)}^\alpha \wedge e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}. \quad (3.10)$$

The following subgroup of the “local Lorentz group”  $SO(D)$  preserves the form of the CKY tensor  $h$ :

$$SO(2)_1 \times SO(2)_2 \times \dots \times SO(2)_n \times SO(2m_1) \times \dots \times SO(2m_N) \times SO(K). \quad (3.11)$$

The  $SO(2)_\mu$  rotates  $(e^\mu, e^{n+\mu})$  and other rotation groups act on one-forms similarly. This symmetry of the vielbeins or orthonormal vectors plays an important role to fix the form of them.

For general vector  $X = X^a \partial_a$ , (3.5) can be rewritten as

$$\nabla_X x_\mu = X(x_\mu) = (X, e_\mu)(e_{n+\mu}, \widehat{\xi}) - (X, e_{n+\mu})(e_\mu, \widehat{\xi}). \quad (3.12)$$

At least one of  $(e_\mu, \widehat{\xi})$  and  $(e_{n+\mu}, \widehat{\xi})$  is non-zero, so  $\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}$  is a non-trivial vector field:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi} = (\widehat{\xi}, e_\mu) e_\mu + (\widehat{\xi}, e_{n+\mu}) e_{n+\mu} \neq 0. \quad (3.13)$$

For any vectors  $X, Y$ , it holds that  $(X, HY) = -(HX, Y)$ . Hence  $\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}$  and  $H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}$  are orthogonal:  $(\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}, H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}) = 0$ . Let  $P_\mu$  be the norm squared of the vector  $\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}$ :

$$P_\mu := \|\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}\|^2 = (\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}, \mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}) > 0, \quad \mu = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (3.14)$$



Note that

$$||H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi}||^2 = (H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi}, H\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi}) = -(\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi}, H^2\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi}) = x_\mu^2 P_\mu. \quad (3.15)$$

Without loss of generality, by using the  $SO(2)_\mu$ -symmetry, one can choose the vectors  $(e_\mu, e_{n+\mu})$  as follows:

$$e_\mu := \frac{1}{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu}} H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi}, \quad e_{n+\mu} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_\mu}} \mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi}. \quad (3.16)$$

This choice of  $\{e_\mu, e_{n+\mu}\}$  leads to the following relations:

$$(e_\mu, \widehat{\xi}) = 0, \quad (e_{n+\mu}, \widehat{\xi}) = \sqrt{P_\mu}. \quad (3.17)$$

Now we have the covariant derivative of the functional eigenvalue  $x_\mu$ :

$$\nabla_X x_\mu = \sqrt{P_\mu}(X, e_\mu). \quad (3.18)$$

As a corollary of this equation, we have

$$dx_\mu = \sqrt{P_\mu}e^\mu, \quad e^\mu = \frac{dx_\mu}{\sqrt{P_\mu}}. \quad (3.19)$$

**Lemma 2.**

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)}\widehat{\xi} = 0. \quad (3.20)$$

(Proof of Lemma 2). Similar to the derivation of (3.12), we have

$$\nabla_X \xi_j = X(\xi_j) = (X, e_\alpha^{(j)})(e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)}, \widehat{\xi}) - (X, e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)})(e_\alpha^{(j)}, \widehat{\xi}), \quad \forall \alpha \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_j\}. \quad (3.21)$$

Then  $\partial_a \xi_j = 0$  leads to the conditions

$$(\widehat{\xi}, e_\alpha^{(j)}) = (\widehat{\xi}, e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)}) = 0, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, m_j, \quad (3.22)$$

which are equivalent to (3.20).  $\square$

Without loss of generality, we can take

$$\mathcal{P}^{(0)}\widehat{\xi} = \sqrt{S}e_K^{(0)}. \quad (3.23)$$

Recall that the property of the eigenvalues  $x_\mu^2$  guarantees that  $\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}\widehat{\xi} \neq 0$ . But there is no reason to assume that  $\mathcal{P}^{(0)}\widehat{\xi}$  is non-trivial. Thus the function  $S$  may be zero.

The associated vector  $\widehat{\xi}$  can be written as

$$\widehat{\xi} = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \sqrt{P_\mu} e_{n+\mu} + \sqrt{S} e_K^{(0)}. \quad (3.24)$$

Let us introduce one-forms  $f^\mu$  and  $f^{n+\mu}$  as follows

$$\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \nabla_a \widehat{\xi} = f^\mu (\partial_a) e_\mu + f^{n+\mu} (\partial_a) e_{n+\mu}. \quad (3.25)$$

The  $SO(2)_\mu$  symmetry fixes the form of these one-forms as follows:

$$f^\mu = f_1^\mu e^\mu + f_2^\mu e^{n+\mu}, \quad f^{n+\mu} = -f_2^\mu e^\mu + f_1^\mu e^{n+\mu}. \quad (3.26)$$

Here  $f_1^\mu$  and  $f_2^\mu$  are some unknown functions.

Applying the argument of [27] to our case, we have

$$i_{\widehat{\xi}} h = - \sum_{\mu=1}^n x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu} e^\mu = d \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=1}^n x_\mu^2 \right). \quad (3.27)$$

Therefore, we also have the following condition:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\xi}} h = i_{\widehat{\xi}} dh + d i_{\widehat{\xi}} h = 0. \quad (3.28)$$

Thus, we have

**Lemma 3.**

$$\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\xi}} h = 0, \quad (3.29)$$

*which is equivalent to the following condition:*

$$(X, H \nabla_Y \widehat{\xi}) = (Y, H \nabla_X \widehat{\xi}). \quad (3.30)$$

By setting  $X = e_\mu$ ,  $Y = e_{n+\mu}$ , one finds

$$-(e_{n+\mu}, \nabla_{e_{n+\mu}} \widehat{\xi}) = (e_\mu, \nabla_{e_\mu} \widehat{\xi}). \quad (3.31)$$

On the other hand, since

$$(e_\mu, \nabla_{e_\mu} \widehat{\xi}) = f^\mu(e_\mu) = f_1^\mu, \quad (e_{n+\mu}, \nabla_{e_{n+\mu}} \widehat{\xi}) = f^{n+\mu}(e_{n+\mu}) = f_1^\mu, \quad (3.32)$$

we find  $f_1^\mu = 0$ .

**Lemma 4.** *The spin-connections have the following form:*

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{\mu,\nu} &= \frac{(1 - \delta_{\mu\nu})}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} \left( -x_\nu \sqrt{P_\nu} e^\mu - x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu} e^\nu \right), \\ \omega_{\mu,n+\nu} &= \delta_{\mu\nu} \omega_{\mu,n+\mu} + \frac{(1 - \delta_{\mu\nu})}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} \left( x_\mu \sqrt{P_\nu} e^{n+\mu} - x_\nu \sqrt{P_\mu} e^{n+\nu} \right), \\ \omega_{n+\mu,n+\nu} &= \frac{(1 - \delta_{\mu\nu})}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} \left( -x_\mu \sqrt{P_\nu} e^\mu - x_\nu \sqrt{P_\mu} e^\nu \right),\end{aligned}\tag{3.33}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{\mu,(\alpha,j)} &= -\frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e_{(j)}^\alpha, & \omega_{n+\mu,(\alpha,j)} &= \frac{\xi_j \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}, \\ \omega_{\mu,(m_j+\alpha,j)} &= -\frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}, & \omega_{n+\mu,(m_j+\alpha,j)} &= -\frac{\xi_j \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e_{(j)}^\alpha,\end{aligned}\tag{3.34}$$

$$\omega_{\mu,(\alpha,0)} = \delta_{\alpha,K} \frac{\sqrt{S}}{x_\mu} e^{n+\mu} - \frac{\sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu} e_{(0)}^\alpha, \quad \omega_{n+\mu,(\alpha,0)} = -\delta_{\alpha,K} \frac{\sqrt{S}}{x_\mu} e^\mu,\tag{3.35}$$

$$\omega_{(\alpha,j),(\beta,k)} = \delta_{jk} \omega_{(\alpha,j),(\beta,j)},\tag{3.36}$$

$$\omega_{(\alpha,j),(m_k+\beta,k)} = \delta_{jk} \omega_{(\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)},\tag{3.37}$$

$$\omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(m_k+\beta,k)} = \delta_{jk} \omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)}\tag{3.38}$$

with the conditions:

$$\omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(\beta,j)} = -\omega_{(\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)},\tag{3.39}$$

$$\omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)} = \omega_{(\alpha,j),(\beta,j)}.\tag{3.40}$$

Also we have

$$\omega_{(\alpha,j),(\beta,0)} = \delta_{\beta,K} \frac{\sqrt{S}}{\xi_j} e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha},\tag{3.41}$$

$$\omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(\beta,0)} = -\delta_{\beta,K} \frac{\sqrt{S}}{\xi_j} e_{(j)}^\alpha,\tag{3.42}$$

and  $\omega_{(\alpha,0),(\beta,0)}$  are not restricted. For  $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, n$  (with no sum),

$$\omega_{\mu,n+\mu} = \frac{\tilde{f}_2^\mu}{\sqrt{P_\mu}} e^{n+\mu} + \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\nu}}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} e^{n+\nu} + \frac{\sqrt{S}}{x_\mu} e_{(0)}^K,\tag{3.43}$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_2^\mu := f_2^\mu - \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{x_\mu P_\nu}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} - \frac{S}{x_\mu}.\tag{3.44}$$

(Proof of Lemma 4). See Appendix A.  $\square$

Next, we calculate the covariant derivative of the associated vector (3.24) using the restricted form of the spin-connections. Using  $\nabla_a e_A = \sum_{B=1}^D \omega_{B,A}(\partial_a) e_B$ , we get the following result:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_a \widehat{\xi} &= \sum_{\mu=1}^n f_2^\mu \left[ e^{n+\mu}(\partial_a) e_\mu - e^\mu(\partial_a) e_{n+\mu} \right] \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_j} \left[ \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\xi_j P_\mu}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} - \frac{S}{\xi_j} \right] \left( -e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}(\partial_a) e_\alpha^{(j)} + e_{(j)}^\alpha(\partial_a) e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)} \right) \\ &+ \nabla_a(\sqrt{S}) e_K^{(0)} + \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\sqrt{P_\mu S}}{x_\mu} e^\mu(\partial_a) e_K^{(0)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

with a consistency condition:

$$f^{n+\mu} = d(\sqrt{P_\mu}) - \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{x_\nu \sqrt{P_\mu P_\nu}}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} e^\nu + \left[ -\sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{x_\nu P_\nu}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} - \frac{S}{x_\mu} \right] e^\mu = -f_2^\mu e^\mu. \quad (3.46)$$

This condition implies

$$\nabla_{e_{n+\nu}} \sqrt{P_\mu} = \nabla_{e_\alpha^{(j)}} \sqrt{P_\mu} = \nabla_{e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)}} \sqrt{P_\mu} = \nabla_{e_\alpha^{(0)}} \sqrt{P_\mu} = 0, \quad (3.47)$$

and

$$\nabla_{e_\nu} \sqrt{P_\mu} = \frac{x_\nu \sqrt{P_\mu P_\nu}}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2}, \quad \text{for } \nu \neq \mu. \quad (3.48)$$

In addition, from (3.45), the co-closedness condition of  $\widehat{\xi}^\vee$  implies

$$\delta \widehat{\xi}^\vee = -\nabla_{e_K^{(0)}} \sqrt{S} = 0. \quad (3.49)$$

From the form of the spin-connections, it follows that the vectors  $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1,2,\dots,n}$  are *involute*:

$$\nabla_{e_\mu} e_\nu = \sum_{\rho=1}^n \omega_{\rho,\nu}(e_\mu) e_\rho \in \text{span}\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1,2,\dots,n}. \quad (3.50)$$

By setting  $X = e_\nu$ , (3.18) implies that  $\nabla_{e_\nu} x_\mu = e_\nu(x_\mu) = \sqrt{P_\mu} \delta_{\mu\nu}$ . Also, using the explicit form of the spin-connections, and the relation (3.48), we can easily check that the vectors  $\{(1/\sqrt{P_\mu})e_\mu\}_{\mu=1,2,\dots,n}$  are mutually commuting. Therefore, from the Frobenius's theorem, we can choose  $x_\mu$  as a local coordinate of the integral submanifold and the vector  $e_\mu$  can be written as follows:

$$e_\mu = \sqrt{P_\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu}. \quad (3.51)$$

From (3.47) and (3.48), we conclude that the function  $P_\mu$  has the form:

$$P_\mu = \frac{\tilde{X}_\mu(x_\mu)}{U_\mu}, \quad (3.52)$$

where  $\tilde{X}_\mu(x_\mu)$  is some function of one variable  $x_\mu$ . We find it convenient to write  $\tilde{X}_\mu$  as follows:

$$\tilde{X}_\mu(x_\mu) = \frac{X_\mu(x_\mu)}{x_\mu^K \prod_{i=1}^N (x_\mu^2 - \xi_i^2)^{m_i}} \quad (3.53)$$

in order to study the Einstein condition [38].

Now we obtain

$$f_2^\mu = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial P_\mu}{\partial x_\mu} + \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{x_\nu P_\nu}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} + \frac{S}{x_\mu}, \quad \tilde{f}_2^\mu = -\sqrt{P_\mu} \frac{\partial \sqrt{P_\mu}}{\partial x_\mu}, \quad (3.54)$$

and the form of  $\omega_{\mu, n+\mu}$  (no sum over  $\mu$ ) is completely fixed as

$$\omega_{\mu, n+\mu} = -\left( \frac{\partial \sqrt{P_\mu}}{\partial x_\mu} \right) e^{n+\mu} + \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\nu}}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} e^{n+\nu} + \frac{\sqrt{S}}{x_\mu} e_{(0)}^K. \quad (3.55)$$

The equation of the closed CKY tensor (3.1) can be rewritten as follows

$$\nabla_a h = (\partial_a)^\vee \wedge \hat{\xi}^\vee, \quad \hat{\xi}^\vee = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \sqrt{P_\mu} e^{n+\mu} + \sqrt{S} e_{(0)}^K. \quad (3.56)$$

For (3.10), using (3.18) and the restricted form of the spin-connections, one can see that

$$\nabla_a h = (\partial_a)^\vee \wedge \sum_{\mu=1}^n \sqrt{P_\mu} e^{n+\mu} + \left[ (I - \mathcal{P}^{(0)}) \partial_a \right]^\vee \wedge \sqrt{S} e_{(0)}^K. \quad (3.57)$$

So  $h$  is a closed CKY tensor provided

$$\sqrt{S} [\mathcal{P}^{(0)} \partial_a]^\vee \wedge e_{(0)}^K = 0. \quad (3.58)$$

There are two cases.

Case I:  $S = 0$ . In this case, the two form  $h$  (3.10) satisfies the closed CKY equation (3.56) without any restriction.

Case II:  $S \neq 0$ . In this case, (3.58) requires that  $\dim T\mathcal{M}^{(0)} = K = 1$ .

**Lemma 5.** *If  $S \neq 0$ , then the function  $S$  must have the following form:*

$$S = \frac{c}{\sigma_n} \quad (3.59)$$

for some nonzero constant  $c$ .

(Proof of Lemma 5). If  $S \neq 0$  with  $K = 1$ , from (3.45), we have

$$\mathcal{P}^{(0)} \nabla_a \widehat{\xi} = \left[ \nabla_a(\sqrt{S}) + \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\sqrt{P_\mu S}}{x_\mu} e^\mu(\partial_a) \right] e_1^{(0)}. \quad (3.60)$$

On the other hand, in order to preserve the symmetry (3.11), the one-form appeared in the bracket of the right-handed side of above equation must be proportional to the one-form  $e_{(0)}^1$ :

$$d(\sqrt{S}) + \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\sqrt{P_\mu S}}{x_\mu} e^\mu = f_0 e_{(0)}^1. \quad (3.61)$$

Here  $f_0$  is some function. From (3.61) and the co-closedness condition (3.49), we have

$$f_0 = \nabla_{e_1^{(0)}}(\sqrt{S}) = 0. \quad (3.62)$$

Then (3.61) leads to the following relation:

$$d \left( \log \left( \sqrt{S \sigma_n} \right) \right) = 0, \quad (3.63)$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 5.  $\square$

Combining these results, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_a \widehat{\xi}_b = & \sum_{\mu=1}^n \left[ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial P_\mu}{\partial x_\mu} - \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{x_\mu P_\nu}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} - \frac{S}{x_\mu} \right] \left( -(e^{n+\mu})_a (e^\mu)_b + (e^\mu)_a (e^{n+\mu})_b \right) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_j} \left[ \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\xi_j P_\mu}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} - \frac{S}{\xi_j} \right] \left( -(e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha})_a (e_{(j)}^\alpha)_b + (e_{(j)}^\alpha)_a (e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha})_b \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.64)$$

Thus we proved that  $\widehat{\xi}$  is a Killing vector:  $\nabla_a \widehat{\xi}_b + \nabla_b \widehat{\xi}_a = 0$ . Or equivalently,

**Lemma 6.**

$$\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\xi}} g = 0. \quad (3.65)$$

Now we have derived two conditions  $\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\xi}}g = 0$  (3.65) and  $\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\xi}}h = 0$  (3.29) from the closedness condition, we can use the theorem of [22]. Let us introduce vector fields  $\eta^{(j)}$ , constructed from the Killing vector  $\widehat{\xi}$  using the actions of the  $(1, 1)$ -tensor  $Q$ . In terms of their “generating functions”, they are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1+\varepsilon} t^j \eta^{(j)} &:= \left( \prod_{\mu=1}^n (1 + tx_\mu^2) \right) (I + tQ)^{-1} \widehat{\xi} \\ &= \sum_{\mu=1}^n \sqrt{P_\mu} \left( \prod_{\nu \neq \mu} (1 + tx_\nu^2) \right) e_{n+\mu} + \sqrt{S} \left( \prod_{\nu=1}^n (1 + tx_\nu^2) \right) e_K^{(0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

Here  $\varepsilon = 0$  if  $S = 0$  and  $\varepsilon = 1$  if  $S \neq 0$ .

From the theorems of [22], it follows that  $\eta^{(j)}$  are mutually commuting Killing vectors. We can introduce local coordinates  $\psi_j$  as follows:

$$\eta^{(j)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_j}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1+\varepsilon. \quad (3.67)$$

Expressions of the vectors  $e_{n+\mu}$  (and  $e_K^{(0)}$  if  $S \neq 0$ ) can be easily read off from (3.66)

$$e_{n+\mu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_\mu}} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1+\varepsilon} \frac{(-1)^j x_\mu^{2(n-1-j)}}{U_\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_j}, \quad (3.68)$$

and

$$\sqrt{S} e_K^{(0)} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_n}. \quad (3.69)$$

Now we have determined the vectors  $e_\mu$  (3.51) and  $e_{n+\mu}$  (3.68). The remaining vectors  $e_\alpha^{(j)}$ ,  $e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)}$  and  $e_\alpha^{(0)}$  are not fixed, in general. For  $S \neq 0$ , where  $K = 1$  and  $\varepsilon = 1$ , the vector  $e_1^{(0)}$  is given by

$$\varepsilon e_1^{(0)} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{S} \sigma_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_n}. \quad (3.70)$$

From these expressions of orthogonal vectors, the vielbeins have the form

$$e^\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_\mu}} dx_\mu, \quad e^{n+\mu} = \sqrt{P_\mu} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma_j(\hat{x}_\mu) \theta_j, \quad (3.71)$$

and  $e_{(j)}^\alpha$ ,  $e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}$ ,  $e_{(0)}^\alpha$  are not fixed yet, in general ( $\varepsilon = 0$ ). If  $S \neq 0$  ( $\varepsilon = 1$ ),

$$\varepsilon e_{(0)}^1 = \varepsilon \sqrt{S} \sum_{j=0}^n \sigma_j \theta_j. \quad (3.72)$$

Here  $\theta_j$  are some 1-forms which satisfy

$$\theta_i \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_j} \right) = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1+\varepsilon. \quad (3.73)$$

By examining the first structure equation

$$de^A + \sum_{B=1}^D \omega^A_B \wedge e^B = 0, \quad (3.74)$$

we can restrict the form of the vielbeins. Let  $(\mathcal{M}^{(j)}, g^{(j)})$  be a  $2m_j$ -dimensional Kähler manifold. Let  $\{\hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha, \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,m_j}$  be an orthonormal frame of  $g^{(j)}$  such that the metric and the corresponding Kähler form  $\omega^{(j)}$  are given by

$$g^{(j)} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_j} \left( \hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha \otimes \hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha + \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} \otimes \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} \right), \quad \omega^{(j)} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_j} \hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha \wedge \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}. \quad (3.75)$$

Examining the first structure equations for  $e^A = e_{(j)}^\alpha$  and  $e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}$ , we obtain the following result:

**Lemma 7.** *The vielbeins  $e_{(j)}^\alpha$  and  $e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}$  are given by*

$$e_{(j)}^\alpha = \left( \prod_{\mu=1}^n (x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2) \right)^{1/2} \hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha, \quad e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} = \left( \prod_{\mu=1}^n (x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2) \right)^{1/2} \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} \quad (3.76)$$

for  $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, m_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

For  $S = 0$  cases, let  $(\mathcal{M}^{(0)}, g^{(0)})$  be a  $K$ -dimensional manifold and  $\{\hat{e}_{(0)}^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,K}$  an orthonormal frame of  $g^{(0)}$ . By examining the first structure equations for  $e^A = e_{(0)}^\alpha$ , we obtain:

**Lemma 8.** *If  $S = 0$ , the vielbeins  $e_{(0)}^\alpha$  are given by*

$$e_{(0)}^\alpha = \sqrt{\sigma_n} \hat{e}_{(0)}^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, K. \quad (3.77)$$

By examining the remaining first structure equation, we find:

**Lemma 9.** *The 1-forms  $\theta_k$  obeys*

$$d\theta_k + 2 \sum_{j=1}^N (-1)^{n-k} \xi_j^{2n-2k-1} \omega^{(j)} = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1+\varepsilon. \quad (3.78)$$



For technical details, see Appendix B.

The combination of Lemma 5, 7, 8, 9 and (3.71), (3.72) is equivalent to Theorem 2. Thus we have completed the proof of Theorem 2.

## Acknowledgements

The work of YY is supported by the Grant-in Aid for Scientific Research (No. 19540304 and No. 19540098) from Japan Ministry of Education. The work of TO is supported by the Grant-in Aid for Scientific Research (No. 19540304 and No. 20540278) from Japan Ministry of Education.

## A Proof of Lemma 4

### A.1 Projectors and derivatives

In this subsection, we briefly review how projectors behave under an action of derivatives. We consider the property in general setting. In the next subsection, we use it to our specific problem.

Let  $F$  be a  $(1, 1)$ -tensor in  $D$ -dimension. Let us denote its eigenvalue set by  $E(F)$ :

$$E(F) = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We choose  $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$  if  $i \neq j$ . An element  $\lambda_j \in E(F)$  appears as one of eigenvalues of  $F$  with certain multiplicities. Let us introduce the projectors as follows:

$$F = \sum_{j=1}^K \lambda_j \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}, \quad \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda')} = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda)}, \quad \lambda, \lambda' \in E(F). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Let us consider the following equation

$$(I + tF)^{-1} = \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{1}{1 + t\lambda_j} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By operating a derivative  $\mathcal{D}$  on the left-handed side of (A.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(I + tF)^{-1} &= - \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{t}{(1 + t\lambda_j)^2} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)} (\mathcal{D}F) \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{1}{1 + t\lambda_j} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ (k \neq j)}}^K \frac{1}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} (\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)} (\mathcal{D}F) \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_k)} + \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_k)} (\mathcal{D}F) \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The action of  $\mathcal{D}$  on the right of (A.3) yields

$$\mathcal{D} \left( \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{1}{1+t\lambda_j} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)} \right) = - \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{t(\mathcal{D}\lambda_j)}{(1+t\lambda_j)^2} \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)} + \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{1}{1+t\lambda_j} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By comparing (A.4) and (A.5), we must have

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}(\mathcal{D}F)\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)} = (\mathcal{D}\lambda_j)\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}, \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, K), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)} = - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ (k \neq j)}}^K \frac{1}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} (\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}(\mathcal{D}F)\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_k)} + \mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_k)}(\mathcal{D}F)\mathcal{P}^{(\lambda_j)}), \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, K). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

## A.2 Covariant derivatives of the projectors for $Q$

Now let us apply the general argument of the previous subsection to  $F = Q$ ,  $\mathcal{D} = \nabla_a$ .<sup>3</sup> We have

$$E(Q) = \{x_\mu^2, \xi_j^2, 0\}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Note that

$$(I + tQ)^{-1} = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{1}{1+tx_\mu^2} \mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{1+t\xi_j^2} \mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)} + \mathcal{P}^{(0)}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$H(I + tQ)^{-1} = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{1}{1+tx_\mu^2} H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{1+t\xi_j^2} H\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$(I + tQ)^{-1} \hat{\xi} = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\sqrt{P_\mu}}{1+tx_\mu^2} e_{n+\mu} + \sqrt{S} e_K^{(0)}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$H(I + tQ)^{-1} \hat{\xi} = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu}}{1+tx_\mu^2} e_\mu, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\nabla_a Q_{bc} = h_{ac} \hat{\xi}_b + h_{ab} \hat{\xi}_c + g_{ab} h_{cd} \hat{\xi}^d + g_{ac} h_{bd} \hat{\xi}^d. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Using these relations and with some work, we can find the covariant derivative of projectors of  $Q$ :

$$\nabla_a [\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}]_{bc} = \sum_{\substack{\nu=1 \\ (\nu \neq \mu)}}^n \frac{F_{abc}^{\mu,\nu}}{x_\mu^2 - x_\nu^2} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{F_{abc}^{\mu,j}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} + \frac{F_{abc}^{\mu,0}}{x_\mu^2}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Instead of  $Q$ , we can choose  $F = H$ . But for our purposes, it is sufficient to set  $F = Q$ .

$$\nabla_a[\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)}]_{bc} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{F_{abc}^{j,\mu}}{\xi_j^2 - x_\mu^2} + \frac{F_{abc}^{j,0}}{\xi_j^2}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$\nabla_a[\mathcal{P}^{(0)}]_{bc} = - \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{F_{abc}^{0,\mu}}{x_\mu^2} - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{F_{abc}^{0,j}}{\xi_j^2}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where

$$F_{abc}^{\mu,\nu} = \left\{ x_\nu \sqrt{P_\nu} [\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}]_{ab} (e^\nu)_c + \sqrt{P_\nu} [H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}]_{ab} (e^{n+\nu})_c + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\} + (b \leftrightarrow c), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$F_{abc}^{\mu,j} = F_{abc}^{j,\mu} = \sqrt{P_\mu} \left( x_\mu [\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)}]_{ab} (e^\mu)_c + [H\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)}]_{ab} (e^{n+\mu})_c \right) + (b \leftrightarrow c), \quad (\text{A.18})$$

$$F_{abc}^{\mu,0} = F_{abc}^{0,\mu} = x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu} [\mathcal{P}^{(0)}]_{ab} (e^\mu)_c + \sqrt{S} [H\mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)}]_{ab} (e_{(0)}^K)_c + (b \leftrightarrow c), \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$F_{abc}^{j,0} = F_{abc}^{0,j} = \sqrt{S} [H\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)}]_{ab} (e_{(0)}^K)_c + (b \leftrightarrow c). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

**Remark.** Lemma 1 is equivalent to the constraint (A.6) for  $F = H$  or  $F = Q$ . The closed CKY tensor imposes strong constraints on the dimension of the space of a functional eigenvalue through (A.6).

### A.3 Restrictions on the spin connections

Recall that

$$e_{n+\mu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_\mu}} \mathcal{P}^{(x_\mu^2)} \widehat{\xi}, \quad e_\mu = \frac{1}{x_\mu} H e_{n+\mu}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)} e_\alpha^{(j)} = e_\alpha^{(j)}, \quad \mathcal{P}^{(\xi_j^2)} e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)} = e_{m_j+\alpha}^{(j)}, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

$$\mathcal{P}^{(0)} e_\alpha^{(0)} = e_\alpha^{(0)}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

By taking covariant derivatives of these relations, and by comparing with the following equations:  $\nabla_a e_A = \sum_{B=1}^D \omega^B_A (\partial_a) e_B$ , we can prove Lemma 4.

## B Some details on the first structure equation

### B.1 $e_{(j)}^\alpha$ and $e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}$

We first consider the first structure equations for  $e_{(j)}^\alpha$  and  $e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}$  and show that they can be solved by introducing an orthonormal frame of a  $2m_j$ -dimensional Kähler manifold.

From the equations

$$de_{(j)}^\alpha + \sum_{B=1}^D \omega_{(\alpha,j),B} \wedge e^B = 0, \quad de_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} + \sum_{B=1}^D \omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),B} \wedge e^B = 0, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} de_{(j)}^\alpha - \left( \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e^\mu \right) \wedge e_{(j)}^\alpha + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} \omega_{(\alpha,j),(\beta,j)} \wedge e_{(j)}^\beta \\ + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} \left\{ \omega_{(\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)} + \delta_{\alpha\beta} \left( \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\xi_j \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e^{n+\mu} - \frac{\sqrt{S}}{\xi_j} e_{(0)}^K \right) \right\} \wedge e_{(j)}^{m_j+\beta} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} de_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} - \left( \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e^\mu \right) \wedge e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} \omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)} \wedge e_{(j)}^{m_j+\beta} \\ + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} \left\{ \omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(\beta,j)} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} \left( \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\xi_j \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e^{n+\mu} - \frac{\sqrt{S}}{\xi_j} e_{(0)}^K \right) \right\} \wedge e_{(j)}^\beta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Note that

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{x_\mu \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e^\mu = \frac{1}{2} d \left( \log \prod_{\mu=1}^n (x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2) \right). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Let us consider a  $2m_j$ -dimensional space with metric  $g^{(j)}$ . Let us denote an orthonormal frame of  $g^{(j)}$  by  $\{\hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha, \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha}\}_{\alpha=1,2,\dots,m_j}$ . The corresponding spin-connections are written as follows:

$$d\hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{\alpha,\beta} \wedge \hat{e}_{(j)}^\beta + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{\alpha,m_j+\beta} \wedge \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\beta} = 0, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$d\hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{m_j+\alpha,\beta} \wedge \hat{e}_{(j)}^\beta + \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{m_j+\alpha,m_j+\beta} \wedge \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\beta} = 0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We can find the solutions of (B.2) and (B.3). They are given by

$$e_{(j)}^\alpha = \left( \prod_{\mu=1}^n (x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2) \right)^{1/2} \hat{e}_{(j)}^\alpha, \quad e_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} = \left( \prod_{\mu=1}^n (x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2) \right)^{1/2} \hat{e}_{(j)}^{m_j+\alpha} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{(\alpha,j),(\beta,j)} &= (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{\alpha,\beta}, \\ \omega_{(\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)} &= (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{\alpha,m_j+\beta} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} \left( \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\xi_j \sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu^2 - \xi_j^2} e^{n+\mu} - \frac{\sqrt{S}}{\xi_j} e_{(0)}^K \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\omega_{(m_j+\alpha,j),(m_j+\beta,j)} = (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{m_j+\alpha,m_j+\beta}.$$

Now the conditions (3.39) and (3.40) lead to the Kähler conditions of  $g^{(j)}$ :

$$(\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{m_j+\alpha,\beta} = -(\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{\alpha,m_j+\beta}, \quad (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{m_j+\alpha,m_j+\beta} = (\hat{\omega}^{(j)})_{\alpha,\beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \dots, m_j. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The  $(1, 1)$ -tensor  $H$  plays the role of a complex structure in this underlying manifold, up to overall constant  $\xi_j$ .

## B.2 $e_{(0)}^\alpha$

Next, let us consider the first structure equations in the zero-eigenvalue sector. We have

$$\begin{aligned} de_{(0)}^\alpha &- \left( \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\sqrt{P_\mu}}{x_\mu} e^\mu \right) \wedge e_{(0)}^\alpha \\ &+ \delta_{\alpha,K} \sqrt{S} \left( \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{2}{x_\mu} e^\mu \wedge e^{n+\mu} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{2}{\xi_j} \sum_{\beta=1}^{m_j} e_{(j)}^\beta \wedge e_{(j)}^{m_j+\beta} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{\beta=1}^K \omega_{(\alpha,0),(\beta,0)} \wedge e_{(0)}^\beta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

We easily solve this equation if  $S = 0$ . Let  $\hat{e}_{(0)}^\alpha$  be an orthonormal frame of a  $K$ -dimensional manifold  $(\mathcal{M}^{(0)}, g^{(0)})$  and set

$$e_{(0)}^\alpha := \left( \prod_{\mu=1}^n x_\mu \right) \tilde{e}_{(0)}^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, K. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Then the first structure equations for  $S = 0$  becomes those of the orthonormal frame  $\{\tilde{e}_{(0)}^\alpha\}$ :

$$d\tilde{e}_{(0)}^\alpha + \sum_{\beta=1}^K \tilde{\omega}_{(\alpha,0),(\beta,0)} \wedge \tilde{e}_{(0)}^\beta = 0, \quad (\text{B.12})$$

with

$$\omega_{(\alpha,0),(\beta,0)} = \tilde{\omega}_{(\alpha,0),(\beta,0)}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

For  $S \neq 0$ , we have (3.72). In this case, it can be treated in the same way with the first structure equation of  $e^{n+\mu}$ . With easy local calculation, we can obtain the Lemma 9.

## References

- [1] K. Yano, “Some remarks on tensor fields and curvature,” *Ann. Math.* **55** (1952) 328-347.
- [2] S. Tachibana, “On conformal Killing tensor in a Riemannian space,” *Tôhoku Math. J.* **21** (1969) 56-64.

- [3] T. Kashiwada, “On conformal Killing tensor,” *Natur. Sci. Rep. Ochanomizu Univ.* **19** (1968) 67-74.
- [4] S. Tachibana and T. Kashiwada, “On the integrability of Killing-Yano’s equation,” *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **21** (1969) 259-265.
- [5] R. Floyd, “The Dynamics of Kerr Fields,” PhD. Thesis (London 1973).
- [6] R. Penrose, “Naked singularities,” *Annals N.Y. Acad. Sci.* **224** (1973) 125-134.
- [7] W. Chen, H. Lü and C.N. Pope, “General Kerr-NUT-AdS metrics in all dimensions,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 5323-5340, [arXiv:hep-th/0604125](#).
- [8] N. Hamamoto, T. Houri, T. Oota and Y. Yasui, “Kerr-NUT-de Sitter curvature in all dimensions,” *J. Phys.* **A40** (2007) F177-F184, [arXiv:hep-th/0611285](#).
- [9] R.C. Myers and M.J. Perry, “Black holes in higher dimensional space-times,” *Ann. Phys.* **172** (1986) 304-347.
- [10] S.W. Hawking, C.J. Hunter and M.M. Taylor-Robinson, “Rotation and the AdS/CFT correspondence,” *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 064005, [arXiv:hep-th/9811056](#).
- [11] G.W. Gibbons, H. Lü, D.N. Page and C.N. Pope, “The general Kerr-de Sitter metrics in all dimensions,” *J. Geom. Phys.* **53** (2005) 49-73, [arXiv:hep-th/0404008](#).
- [12] G.W. Gibbons, H. Lü, D.N. Page and C.N. Pope, “Rotating black holes in higher dimensions with a cosmological constant,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 171102, [arXiv:hep-th/0409155](#).
- [13] W. Chen, H. Lü and C.N. Pope, “Kerr-de Sitter Black Holes with NUT Charges,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B762** (2007) 38-54, [arXiv:hep-th/0601002](#).
- [14] V.P. Frolov and D. Kubizňák, “‘Hidden’ Symmetries of Higher Dimensional Rotating Black Holes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 11101, [arXiv:gr-qc/0605058](#).
- [15] D. Kubizňák and V.P. Frolov, “Hidden Symmetry of Higher Dimensional Kerr-NUT-AdS Spacetimes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) F1-F6, [arXiv:gr-qc/0610144](#).
- [16] D.N. Page, D. Kubizňák, M. Vasudevan and P. Krtouš, “Complete Integrability of Geodesic Motion in General Kerr-NUT-AdS Spacetimes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 061102, [arXiv:hep-th/0611083](#).

- [17] P. Krtouš, D. Kubizňák, D.N. Page and M. Vasudevan, “Constants of Geodesic Motion in Higher-Dimensional Black-Hole Spacetime,” *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) 084034, [arXiv:hep-th/0707.0001](#).
- [18] V.P. Frolov, P. Krtouš and D. Kubizňák, “Separability of Hamilton-Jacobi and Klein-Gordon Equations in General Kerr-NUT-AdS Spacetimes,” *JHEP* **0702** (2007) 005, [arXiv:hep-th/0611245](#).
- [19] T. Oota and Y. Yasui, “Separability of Dirac equation in higher dimensional Kerr-NUT-de Sitter spacetime,” *Phys. Lett.* **B659** (2008) 688-693, [arXiv:0711.0078\[hep-th\]](#).
- [20] P. Davis, “A Killing tensor for higher dimensional Kerr-AdS black holes with NUT charge,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 3607-3618, [arXiv:hep-th/0602118](#).
- [21] P. Krtouš, D. Kubizňák, D.N. Page and V.P. Frolov, “Killing-Yano Tensors, Rank-2 Killing Tensors, and Conserved Quantities in Higher Dimensions,” *JHEP* **0702** (2007) 004, [arXiv:hep-th/0612029](#).
- [22] T. Houri, T. Oota and Y. Yasui, “Closed conformal Killing-Yano tensor and geodesic integrability,” *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** (2008) 025204, [arXiv:hep-th/0707.4039](#).
- [23] T. Houri, T. Oota and Y. Yasui, “Closed conformal Killing-Yano tensor and Kerr-NUT-de Sitter uniqueness,” *Phys. Lett.* **B656** (2007) 214-216, [arXiv:0708.1368\[hep-th\]](#).
- [24] D. Kubizňák and V.P. Frolov, “Stationary strings and branes in the higher-dimensional Kerr-NUT-(A)dS spacetimes,” *JHEP* **0802** (2008) 007, [arXiv:0711.2300\[hep-th\]](#).
- [25] A. Sergyeyev and P. Krtouš, “Complete Set of Commuting Symmetry Operators for Klein-Gordon Equation in Generalized Higher-Dimensional Kerr-NUT-(A)dS Spacetimes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D77** (2008) 044033, [arXiv:0711.4623\[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] P. Connell, V.P. Frolov and D. Kubizňák, “Solving parallel transport equations in the higher-dimensional Kerr-NUT-(A)dS spacetimes,” [arXiv:0803.3259\[gr-qc\]](#).

- [27] P. Krtouš, V.P. Frolov and D. Kubizňák, “Hidden Symmetries of Higher Dimensional Black Holes and Uniqueness of the Kerr-NUT-(A)dS spacetime,” [arXiv:0804.4705\[hep-th\]](#).
- [28] V.P. Frolov, “Hidden Symmetries of Higher-Dimensional Black Hole Spacetimes,” [arXiv:0712.4157\[gr-qc\]](#).
- [29] V.P. Frolov and D. Kubizňák, “Higher-Dimensional Black Holes: Hidden Symmetries and Separation of Variables,” [arXiv:0802.0322\[hep-th\]](#).
- [30] H. Kodama and A. Ishibashi, “A master equation for gravitational perturbations of maximally symmetric black holes,” *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **172** (2003) 701-722, [arXiv:hep-th/0305147](#).
- [31] H.K. Kunduri, J. Lucietti and H.S. Reall, “Gravitational perturbations of higher-dimensional rotating black holes: Tensor Perturbations,” *Phys. Rev.* **D74** (2006) 084021, [arXiv:hep-th/0606076](#).
- [32] K. Murata and J. Soda, “Stability of Five-dimensional Myers-Perry Black Holes with Equal Angular Momenta,” [arXiv:0803.1371\[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] S. Benenti and M. Francaviglia, “Remarks on Certain Separability Structures and Their Applications to General Relativity,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **10** (1979) 79-92.
- [34] E.G. Kalnins and W. Miller, Jr., “Killing tensors and nonorthogonal variable separation for Hamiltonian-Jacobi equations,” *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **12** (1981) 617-629.
- [35] S. Benenti, “Separation of Variables in the Geodesic Hamilton-Jacobi Equation,” in *Symplectic Geometry and Mathematical Physics*, Progress in Mathematics Vol. **99**, ed. by P. Donato, C. Duval, J. Elhadad and G.M. Tuynman, Birkhäuser, (1991) 1-36.
- [36] G.W. Gibbons and P.J. Ruback, “The hidden symmetries of Taub-NUT and monopole scattering,” *Phys. Lett.* **B188** (1987) 226-230.
- [37] J.W. van Holten, “Supersymmetry and the geometry of Taub-NUT,” *Phys. Lett.* **B342** (1995) 47-52, [arXiv:hep-th/9409139](#).
- [38] T. Houri, T. Oota and Y. Yasui, “Generalized Kerr-NUT-de Sitter metrics in all dimensions,” [arXiv:0805.0838\[hep-th\]](#).